

REMARKS

I. Status of the Application

Claims 1-24 are pending in this application. In the February 5, 2007 office action, the

Examiner:

A. Allowed claims 15-24;

B. Rejected claims 1-11 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by US 5,808,924 to White; and

C. Objected to claims 12 and 13 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim.

The allowance of claims 15-24 is gratefully acknowledged. In this response, applicants have amended a typographical error in the specification. The applicant has also added new claims 25-38 for consideration. The new claims correspond to combinations of the allowable claims and rejected independent claims. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

II. Amendment to the Specification

The specification was amended to correct an inadvertent typographical error. In particular, on page 5, line 9 of the specification as filed has been amended to read “proportional to N” as opposed to “proportional to N².” This amendment does not constitute new matter. In particular, support for this amendment may be found in the specification on page 5, line 11, which states that the “filter arrangement reduces the calculational effort to the

order of $O(N)$.” Additionally, page 5, lines 1-3 of the specification reads that “the filter output signal is then obtained by summing up the intermediate signals corresponding to the first and second order rational filter transfer functions.”

III. New Claims 25 and 26

New claims 25 and 26 correspond to combinations of existing claims. In particular, new claim 25 corresponds to a combination of claim 14 and the allowable subject matter from claim 12, and new claim 26 corresponds to a combination of claim 14 and the allowable subject matter of claim 13. Accordingly, no new matter has been introduced. Moreover, because claim 14 includes many of the limitations of claim 6, it is believed that the combinations of claim 14 with claims 12 and 13 corresponds substantially to claims 12 and 13 being written in independent form. Therefore, it is believed that claims 25 and 26 are in condition for allowance.

IV. New Claims 27 and 33

New claims 27 and 33 correspond to claims 12 and 13, respectively, rewritten in independent form to include the limitations of their base claim, i.e. claim 6. Accordingly, claims 27 and 33 are in condition for allowance.

V. New Claims 28-32 and 34-38

New claims 28-32 and 34-38 correspond to cancelled claims 7-11 which have been rewritten to depend from new claim 27 and new claim 33, respectively. Accordingly, because

28-32 and 34-38 depend from and incorporate the limitations of allowable claims 27 and 33, respectively, claims 28-32 and 34-38 are in condition for allowance as well.

VI. Conclusion

For all of the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted the applicant has made a patentable contribution to the art. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of this application is therefore respectfully requested.

In the event applicant has inadvertently overlooked the need for an extension of time or payment of an additional fee, the applicant conditionally petitions therefore, and authorizes any fee deficiency to be charged to deposit account 13-0014.

May 4, 2007

Respectfully submitted,



David R. Moorman
Attorney for Applicants
Attorney Registration No. 59,323
Maginot Moore & Beck
Chase Tower
111 Monument Circle, Suite 3250
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204-5109
Telephone: (317) 638-2922